



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/535,158	03/24/2000	Katsuhiro Aoki	0557-49331-2	1887
22850	7590 10/21/2003		EXAM	INER
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			GRAINGER, QUA	ANA MASHELL
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2852	

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		r/			
	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)			
•	10/525150	Vate been at a			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
Office Addor Culture,	Quana Grainger	2852			
The MAILING DATE of this communication	on appears on the cover sheet wi	1			
D. Sad for Donly					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a lition. It is, a reply within the statutory minimum of thir y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON the statute of the application to become Alice to the application to the applic	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on ·				
2a) This action is FINAL 2b)	This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice	under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C	atters, prosecution as to the merits is .D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
(a) Claim(s) $[-13, 15-27, 29]$ is/a	re pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) -11,15-25,29 is/	are withdrawn from consideratio	on.			
5) Claim(s)	is/are allower	ed.			
SEVEL Claim(s) 12 , 26	is/are reject	ed.			
7) Claim(s) 13, 27	is/are objec	ted to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to	to restriction and/or election requ	uirement.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/ar	e: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected	to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any object	tion to the drawing(s) be held in abo	eyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) The proposed drawing correction filed of	on is: a) ☐ approved	b) disapproved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are requ					
12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority d	ocuments have been received.				
2 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
application from the Internation * See the attached detailed Office action	ational Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a) for a list of the certified copies	not received.			
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	or domestic priority under 35 U.S	c.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).			
a) The translation of the foreign land	quage provisional application ha	is been received.			
Attachment(s)		days Summans (DTO 413) Daner No(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) P	TO-948) 5) Notic	view Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ee of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) r:			
		·- ··· 17			

Art Unit: 2852

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as

set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be

patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at

the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject

matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was

made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wada et.

al. in view of the admitted prior art of record. Wada et al. teaches a latent image bearing member

Art Unit: 2852

1 having a potential thereon; a developing device 12, the developing device including, a conveyor member 2-3 configured to convey the one-component developer from a one-component developer supply anti to a developing region where pant of the developer-bearing member is closely spaced next to a part of the latent image bearing member 1, a thin layer forming, device 7 configured to form the one-component developer being conveyed on the conveyor member into a uniform thin layer having a height corresponding to 1 to 1.5 times the diameter of the toner particles of the one-component developer. The development region includes a gap between the conveyor surface portion and the opposed photoconductive surface portion that is equal to or less than about 150 micron.

Wada et al. also teaches as image forming apparatus comprising means for bearing a latent image including image areas and means for applying a developing bias voltage 10 to the means for conveying when the developing operation is performed; the thin layer forming device 7 configured to form the one-component developer on the conveyor member 1 into a uniform thin layer having a height corresponding to 1 to 1.5 times a diameter of the toner particles of the one-component developer (Figures 2-3; column 8). Wada et al. does not teach a two level developing method.

The admitted prior art of record teaches that a two level developing method is conventional (specification: page 1, lines 12-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary shill in the art at the time tile invention was made to use the teaching of Wada et al. with an image forming device using a developing method such as taught by the admitted prior art of

Art Unit: 2852

record to also avoid agglomerates and obtain agglomerates free developer (column 1, line 65 -

column 2, line 5).

Response to Arguments

Applicant continues to argues that the admitted prior art of record does not teach what

was known conventionally in the United states but what was known only in Japan. The admitted

prior art discusses what was known in a printing device and thus what is known wherever the

printing device is located and patented. Further, it is clearly not applicant's position that

applicant invented two level developing. The admitted prior art of record does not state that

applicant is referring only to what is known in Japan. The text communicates what is known to

one of ordinary skill in the printing art.

Applicant argues that the location of the teaching of the height of the developer and the

gap has not been indicated in the reference. The height of the developer is set by the depth of the

grooves and the regulating member and are thus 1/4 to 3 times the diameter of the developer and

is clearly discussed in column 8 and shown in Figures 2 or 3.

Applicant argues that the reference does not teach the toner layer has a height

corresponding to 1 to 1.5 times the diameter of the toner particles and this is not the same as the

gap spacing of the blade and the final layer thickness. The height of the developer is set by the

depth of the grooves and the regulating member and are thus 1/4 to 3 times the diameter of the

developer.

The claims remain rejected as discussed above.

Page 4

Art Unit: 2852

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 13 and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

5. Claims 1-11, 14-25, and 28-29 are allowed.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Quana Grainger whose telephone number is 703-308-7616. The

examiner can normally be reached on weekdays between the hours of 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Arthur Grimley can be reached on 703-308-1373. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular

communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-3431.

Quana Grainger Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2852

QG

October 20, 2003

Page 5